



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/706,181	11/03/2000	Theron Tock	DANAP001	5562

22434 7590 01/28/2004  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP  
P.O. BOX 778  
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER

LAZARO, DAVID R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/706,181

Applicant(s)

TOCK ET AL.

Examiner

David Lazaro

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,3,4. 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-20 are pending in this Office Action.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 08/16/02, 07/01/03 and 10/07/03, have been considered by the examiner.

### ***Priority***

2. This application claims benefit of 60/235,513 with priority date of 09/26/2000.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: "third-party plug-in" on line 2 should be "third-party application plug-in". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claim 13 recites the limitation "the central storage". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claim 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "Intermediaries: new places for producing and manipulating Web content" by Barrett and Magilo (Barrett). Note: This prior art was provided by applicant through an IDS.

9. With respect to Claim 1, Barrett teaches an information retrieval system that serves to retrieve information requested by a client machine from a remote server via a network, the client machine operating a network browser (Page 510, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph "Intermediaries..."), said system comprising: an intermediate server coupled to the network (Page 514-515, Section 4.1 "Configurations"), said intermediate server receives requests destined for the remote server (Page 511 Fig. 2) and performs processing on responses to the requests from the remote server before returning the responses to the client machine (Page 512, Sections 3.1 and 3.2); and at least one third-party application plug-in installed on said intermediate server (Page 512 Section 3 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraphs and Page 513, Last paragraph of Section 3.2 "WBI operation"), said third-party application plug-in rendering at least one feature available at the client

machine without counterpart plug-ins at the client machine (Page 510, "Web Personalization" and "Content Distillation" paragraphs).

10. With respect to Claim 2, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches said third-party application plug-in operates at said intermediate server operates to process the responses to the requests from the remote server before returning the responses to the client machine (Page 512, Sections 3.1 and 3.2).

11. With respect to Claim 3, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches said third-party plug-in operates at said intermediate server to pass the responses to the requests from the remote server through a application filter provided by said third-party application plug-in before returning the responses to the client machine (Page 512, Section 3).

12. With respect to Claim 4, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches said information retrieval system further comprises: a data storage device operatively connected or within said intermediate server (Page 513 Fig. 4); and a cookie manager operable on said intermediate server (Page 513, Section 3.3.1 "Cookie Manager"), said cookie manager operates to manage centralized storage of cookies in said data storage device with respect to the client machine and the remote server (Page 513 Fig. 4), wherein cookies from the remote server provided with a response are stored in said data storage device by said cookie manager instead of at the client machine (Page 513 Fig. 4), and wherein said cookie manager retrieves previously stored cookies from said data storage device that are associated with the remote server

and the client machine (Page 513 Fig. 4), and provides the retrieved previously stored cookies to the remote server with the request (Page 513 Fig. 4).

13. With respect Claim 5, Barrett teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches said information retrieval system further comprises: a data storage device operatively connected or within said intermediate server (Page 510 "Document caching" paragraph); and a history manager operable on said intermediate server, said history manager operates to manage centralized storage of previously requested resources in said data storage device with respect to the client machine (Page 509, abstract and Page 510, "Document caching" paragraph).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett in view of U.S. Patent 5,752,022 by Chiu et al. (Chiu). Chiu was also provided through applicant's IDS.

16. With respect to Claim 6, Barrett teaches an intermediary server system (Page 514-515, Section 4.1 Configurations), comprising: a web server that receives requests for resources from client machines (Page 510, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph "Intermediaries..."), a HTTP handler operatively connected to said web server, said HTTP handler receives

the requests for resources, modifies the requests (Page 513 Table 1 "Request Editor") to be directed to appropriate remote servers via the network, and forwards the modified requests for resources to the appropriate remote servers (Page 514 Section 4, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph) and a HTML parser operatively connected to said HTTP handler, said HTML parser receives the resources supplied by the appropriate remote servers in response to the modified requests (Page 513 Table 1 "Document Editor"). Barrett does not explicitly disclose modifying the resources such that certain links are modified to be directed to the intermediary server system. However, one can modify received resources such that certain links contained therein can be modified to be directed to the intermediary server system as taught by Chiu (Col. 3 lines 11-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by Barrett and modify it as indicated by Chiu such that said HTML parser receives the resources supplied by the appropriate remote servers in response to the modified requests, and modifies the resources such that at least certain links contained therein are modified to be directed to said intermediary server system instead of remote servers. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for a system that can provide additional linking information or functions to resources other than those originally provided (Col. 2 lines 35-60 and Col. 3 line 21-25).

17. With respect to Claim 7, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 6 and further teaches said intermediary server system further comprises: a session manager that manages sessions between the client machines or their users and said intermediary server system (Page 515, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph); a server information

manager that manages remote server supplied identification or state information provided to said intermediary server system by remote servers (Page 513, Section 3.3.1 Cookie Manager); and a data store for storage of session management data provided by said session manager and remote server supplied identification or state information provided by said server information manager (Page 513, Section 3.3.1 Cookie Manager).

18. With respect to Claim 8, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 7 and further teaches the remote server supplied identification or the state information provided by said server information manager comprises "cookies" (Page 513, Section 3.3.1 "Cookie Manager").

19. With respect to Claim 9, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 6 and further teaches said intermediary server system further comprises: a history manager, said history manager operates to manage storage and retrieval of resources previously requested by particular the client machines or their users (Page 509, abstract and Page 510, "Document caching" paragraph).

20. With respect to Claim 10, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 6 and further teaches said intermediary server system further comprises: an application plug-in framework that facilitates incorporating application plug-ins within said intermediary server system so as to provide additional functionality (Page 512 Section 3, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraphs and Page 513, Last paragraph of section 3.2 "WBI operation").



Art Unit: 2155

21. With respect to Claim 11, Barrett teaches a method for processing resource requests received at an intermediary server via a network (Page 510, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph "Intermediaries..."), said method comprising the acts of: (a) receiving, at the intermediary server, a resource request from a requestor, the resource request requesting a particular resource (Page 511, Fig. 2); (b) determining a hostname for a remote server hosting the particular resource being requested (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically end of 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph); (c) sending a request for the particular resource to the remote server based on the determined hostname (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically steps 1 and 2); (d) receiving, at the intermediary server, a response to the request from the remote server; and sending a modified response to the requestor (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically steps 3 and 4). Barrett does not explicitly disclose modifying the response so that links in the response will point to the intermediate server. However, one can modify responses such that links within them can be modified to point to the intermediary server as taught by Chiu (Col. 3 lines 11-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Barrett and modify it as indicated by Chiu such that the method further comprises the acts of (e) modifying the response so that links within the response point to the intermediate server; and (f) sending the modified response to the requestor. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for a system that can provide additional linking information or functions to resources other than those originally provided (Col. 2 lines 35-60 and Col. 3 line 21-25).

Art Unit: 2155

22. With respect to Claim 12, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 11 and further teaches said method further comprises the acts of: (g) centrally saving the modified response such that the modified response is able to be subsequently recalled by the requestor (Page 509, abstract and Page 510, "Document caching" paragraph).

23. With respect to Claim 13, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 12 and further teaches said saving (g) saves the modified response in the central storage (Page 510, "Document caching" paragraph).

24. With respect to Claim 14, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 11 and further teaches the resource request is a HTTP (Page 514 Section 4, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph) request including at least a URL having an initial hostname for the particular resource (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically end of 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph).

25. With respect to Claim 15, Barrett teaches A method for processing a resource requested received at an intermediary server via a network (Page 510, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph "Intermediaries..."), said method comprising the acts of: (a) receiving, at the intermediary server, a resource request from a requestor (Page 511, Fig. 2); (b) determining an address for a remote server hosting the requested resource (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically end of 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph); (c) retrieving at least one cookie associated with the remote server from a central storage associated with the intermediary server (Page 513, Fig. 4 and Section 3.3.1 "Cookie Manager"); (d) sending a request for the requested resource with the retrieved cookie to the remote server (Page 513, Fig. 4); (e) receiving, at the intermediary server, a response to the request

from the remote server (Page 513, Fig. 4 ); (f) storing any cookies provided with the received response in the central storage such that the cookies are associated with the remote server (Page 513, Fig. 4); sending the modified response to the requestor (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically steps 3 and 4). Barrett does not explicitly disclose modifying the response so that links in the response will point to the intermediate server. However, one can modify responses such that links within them can be modified to point to the intermediary server as taught by Chiu (Col. 3 lines 11-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Barrett and modify it as indicated by Chiu such that the method further comprises the acts of (e) modifying the response so that links within the response point to the intermediate server; and (f) sending the modified response to the requestor. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for a system that can provide additional linking information or functions to resources other than those originally provided (Col. 2 lines 35-60 and Col. 3 line 21-25).

26. With respect to Claim 16, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 15 and further teaches said method further comprises the acts of:(i) saving the modified response to the central storage such that the modified response is associated with the requestor (Page 509, abstract and Page 510, "Document caching" paragraph).

27. With respect to Claim 17, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 15 and further teaches the resource request is a HTTP (Page 514 Section 4, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph) request including at least a URL having an initial hostname for the particular resource (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically end of 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph).

Art Unit: 2155

28. With respect to Claim 18, Barrett teaches a computer readable medium including at least computer program code for processing resource requests received at an intermediary server via a network (Page 510, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph "Intermediaries..."), said computer readable medium comprising: computer code for receiving, at the intermediary server, a resource request from a requestor, the resource request requesting a particular resource (Page 511, Fig. 2); computer code for determining a hostname for a remote server hosting the particular resource being requested (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically end of 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph); computer code for sending a request for the particular resource to the remote server based on the determined hostname (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically steps 1 and 2); computer code for receiving, at the intermediary server, a response to the request from the remote server; and sending a modified response to the requestor (Page 512 Section 3.2 "WBI operation", specifically steps 3 and 4). Barrett does not explicitly disclose computer code for modifying the response so that links in the response will point to the intermediate server. However, one can modify responses such that links within them can be modified to point to the intermediary server as taught by Chiu (Col. 3 lines 11-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the computer readable medium disclosed by Barrett and modify it as indicated by Chiu such that the computer readable medium further comprises computer code for modifying the response so that links within the response point to the intermediate server; and computer code for sending the modified response to the requestor. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for a system

that can provide additional linking information or functions to resources other than those originally provided (Col. 2 lines 35-60 and Col. 3 line 21-25).

29. With respect to Claim 19, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 18 and further teaches said computer readable medium further comprises: computer program code for centrally saving the modified response such that the modified response is able to be subsequently recalled by the requestor (Page 509, abstract and Page 510, "Document caching" paragraph).

30. With respect to Claim 20, Barrett in view of Chiu teaches all the limitations of Claim 18 and further teaches the response from the remote server comprises HTML data (Page 513, Table 1, "Document Editor").

### ***Conclusion***

31. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

32. U.S. Patent 6,654,814 by Britton et al. "Systems, methods and computer program products for dynamic placement of web content tailoring" November 25, 2003

33. U.S. Patent 6,285,029 by Delph "Kiosk Controller that retrieves content from servers and then pushes the retrieved content to a kiosk in the order specified in a run list" September 4, 2001

34. U.S. Patent 6,052,730 by Felciano et al. "Method for monitoring and/or modifying web browsing sessions" April 18, 2000

Art Unit: 2155

35. U.S. Patent 6,052,715 by Gibson "Apparatus and method in hierarchy of internet web pages for fast return to a network page" April 18, 2000

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lazaro whose telephone number is 703-305-4868. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 703-308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



David Lazaro  
January 21, 2004



**HOSAIN ALAM**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**